



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,950	03/15/2004	William J. Park	2003P19072US	4450

28524 7590 10/20/2006

SIEMENS CORPORATION  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
170 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH  
ISELIN, NJ 08830

EXAMINER
----------

JAWORSKI, FRANCIS J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3768

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/800,950

Applicant(s)

PARK ET AL.

Examiner

Jaworski Francis J.

Art Unit

3768

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2006.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

[Parenthesized claim numbers pertain to the specific claim or claims under rejection in the immediately preceding portion.]

Claims 1 – 4, 11 – 12, 14, 30 - 31 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sliwa, Jr. et al (US5560362), of record in applicants' specification. Sliwa Jr. et al in Fig. 8 teaches structure of an ultrasound transducer comprising a housing 2, a transducer module 12, an electronics assembly of components located in the housing and coupled to the transducers and having an interior portion (central to the back-to-back axis of the transducers and their physical space), with the electronics assembly including a plurality of sub-assemblies comprised of discrete components 29, and first thermal conductor in the form of heat transfer fluid bag 31 thermally coupled to components 29 and operable to move heat from the interior as so defined to a second thermal conductor 15 further towards the exterior within the probe. (Claims 1, 2, 30) .

Since Sliwa Jr. et al states in col. 21 lines 17 – 20 that the heat transfer bag is usable with any of the active transfer embodiments disclosed, this is understood to pertain to the direct substitution of the Fig. 4 thermoelectric cooler 30 into contact with 15 as shown in Fig. 4, this thermoelement being inter alia of Peltier type, both 15 and 30 thereby comprising the 'second thermal conductor' see Sliwa, Jr. et al cols. 15 – 16 bridging. (Claims 3, 4, 31).

Since Sliwa Jr et al uses both heat pipes and cooling loops (Fig. 5 element 23 or Figs. 3d, 3e, respectively) the aforementioned statement of substitution extends to incorporation of the latter in association with the coolant transfer scheme of Fig. 8. (Claims 11 – 12).

The transducer and electronics portions of Sliwa, Jr et al Fig. 8 are separated by at least the backing layer 11 which provides at least some thermal isolation. {This occurs inherently since no physical substance is a pure heat conductor or non-conductor}. (claim 14).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 5 – 9, 11 – 12, 14 – 15, 17 – 19, 21 – 22, 24 - 29 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sliwa, Jr. et al as argued against claim 2 supra, further in view of Kelly, Jr. et al (US5961465) alone or further in view of Matsumoto (JP 04336052 A, Abstract translation attached) or Cohen et al (US6445580).

Claim 10 is again rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable only over the latter three-reference combinations..

Sliwa, Jr. et al taught that the thermoelectric cooler 30 could thermally couple to the transducer itself via Fig. 4 and the bulk of the patent's disclosure is directed to transducer heat transfer and not to electronic subassembly heat transfer, however if Sliwa, Jr. et al be viewed as alternative not additive vis-à-vis Fig. 4 vs 8 teachings, it would have none-the-less been obvious in view of Kelly, Jr. et al Figs. 7a – 7b to couple thermoelectric coolers 90, 92 to electronic subassembly components as well as to the transducer via solid thermal conductors since at least some heat would transfer due to the metallizations on flex circuit 18 which connects the transducer array to the electronic component subassemblies 22. In the alternative, Matsumoto (Abstract

Art Unit: 3768

translation provided) teaches that a Peltier device 13 may draw off heat from the transducer array 11 via solid electrode layer 12a directly hence this renders obvious the modification of Kelly, Jr. et al to have thermoelements 90, 92 at least partially contact the flex circuit electrodes 18, as this variant would incorporate into Sliwa, Jr. et al.

In the alternative still, Cohen et al notes that in an analogous art concerned with high-density high power electronic component operations, i.e. small PCs and related devices, the prior art approach of direct compression heat transfer from subassembly 120 through Peltier device 110 to a heat sink 160 as in Fig. 1 may be relaxed in favor of a metallic heat conductive intermediate 220 (or like components in Figs. 3-4 thereof) to the thermoelement 240 and heat sink 250/vent 260 so that space efficiencies may prevail over the former, piggyback type association. In effect the latter evidences that the artisan considered 'contacting or closely thermally coupled' with respect to proximating an active cooling stage to the heat sources (transducer and/or electronic subassemblies) to be obvious alternatives in the trade-off between design packing efficiencies and heat transfer optimums, all the aforementioned involving solid thermal conductors in the metallization portions.. (Claims 5 – 6, 17-18, 24-26).

Both Sliwa, Jr. et al in col. 11 bottom and Kelly Jr. et al col. 4 top mention liquid thermal conductors as a variant for coupling to heat source components. (Claims 7, 27).

In any of the references, the conductors Sliwa Jr. et al 14 –or 15, Kelly Jr. et al 18, Matsumoto 12a, Cohen et al 230/460 are characterizable as sheets 'over' the heat source and heading exteriorly, with sheets 14 and 15 of Sliwa Jr. et al being thermally coupled. Additionally Sliwa Jr. et al advocate a thermal enhancement sheet 27 for

augmented heat transfer, see Figs. 7b – 7d. (Claims 8, 9, 19). See also method claim arguments *infra*.

Since Matsumoto and Cohen et al evidence that flex circuits which serve as circuit boards at least in Kelly, Jr et al might be directly contacted by the active cooling device, it would have been obvious to do so in Sliwa, Jr. et al in order to augment the heat driven off. (Claim 10).

Since Kelly Jr. et al similar to Sliwa Jr et al refers to heat pipe usage Figs. 5a – 5b or closed liquid cooling loop col. 6 top it would have been obvious to include same as the first thermal conductor as per Sliwa, Jr. et al teachings re Fig. 8. (Claims 11 – 12, 21 – 22).

Similar to the above anticipatory argument, the backing 16 of Kelly Jr. et al provides at least some transducer-electronic component thermal isolation. (Claims 14, 28).

In the above formulation both the cold and hot sides of the thermoelement would be aligned towards the transducer as well as along the circuit components. (Claims 1, 29).

Since the argument *supra* regarding claims 5-6 implicitly pertains to a methodology of cooling both the transducer array and the associated electronics via thermal conductor stages coupled to the electronics the corresponding method claim limitations are met. (Claims 17 – 18).

Claims 13, 20, 23 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 12 immediately above, and further

Art Unit: 3768

in view of Riggs (US3573557) since whereas the former are silent as to cooling loop embedding, it would have been obvious in view of the latter to embed, e.g. by etching a cooling loop for liquid Freon refrigerant, in order to efficiently draw off heat from a high speed operating printed circuit. (claims 13, 20).

Claim 16 is again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sliwa, Jr. et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of \*Dreschel (US6645145). Whereas the former is silent as to the substitution of micromechanical ultrasound transducers, it would have been obvious in view of the latter to incorporate same into in-body probes such as catheters or other small probes since these devices represent a smaller unit transducer, whereupon an active cooling device such as Sliwa Jr. et al would be required to prevent overheating, see col. 15 lines 35 – 39 of the latter.

### **Response to Arguments**

Applicants arguments regarding inapplicability of Sliwa jr et al with respect to interior and exterior orientations of the electronics assembly and the thermal cooling element with respect thereto are not well taken since these terms may be arbitrarily defined such as in the Examiner's interpretation found supra..

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within




Art Unit: 3768

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jaworski Francis J. at telephone number 571-272-4738.

FJJ:fjj

10-12-06

  
Francis J. Jaworski  
Primary Examiner